arXiv:1704.06893v1 [astro-ph.HE] 23 Apr 2017

A minimal model for extragalactic cosmic rays and neutrinos

M. Kachelrieß[1], O. Kalashev[2], S. Ostapchenko[3,4], and D. V. Semikoz[5,6]
[1] *Institutt for fysikk, NTNU, Trondheim, Norway*
[2] *Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia*
[3] *Frankfurt Institute of Advanced Studies, Frankfurt, Germany*
[4] *Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia*
[5] *AstroParticle and Cosmology (APC), Paris, France and*
[6] *National Research Nuclear University (MEPHI), Moscow, Russia*

We aim to explain in a unified way the experimental data on ultrahigh energy cosmic rays (UHECR) and neutrinos, using a single source class and obeying limits on the extragalactic diffuse gamma-ray background (EGRB). If UHECRs only interact hadronically with gas around their sources, the resulting diffuse CR flux can be matched well to the observed one, providing at the same time large neutrino fluxes. However, air showers in the Earth's atmosphere induced by UHECRs with energies $E \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{18}\,\mathrm{eV}$ would reach in such a case their maxima too high. Therefore additional photo-hadronic interactions of UEHCRs close to the accelerator have to be present, in order to modify the nuclear composition of CRs in a relatively narrow energy interval. We include thus both photon and gas backgrounds, and combine the resulting CR spectra with the high-energy part of the Galactic CR fluxes predicted by the escape model. As result, we find a good description of experimental data on the total CR flux, the mean shower depth $X_{\max}$ and its width $\mathrm{RMS}(X_{\max})$ in the whole energy range above $E \simeq 10^{17}\,\mathrm{eV}$. The predicted high-energy neutrino flux matches IceCube measurements, while the contribution to the EGRB is of order 30%.

I. INTRODUCTION

A major motivation for the construction of km^3 neutrino telescopes has been the goal to identify the sources of ultrahigh energy cosmic rays (UHECR): While deflections of charged CRs in magnetic fields have prevented so far a successful correlation of their arrival directions with potential sources even at the highest energies, photons and neutrinos point back to their sources. These neutral secondaries are produced by UHECRs interacting with gas or photons in their sources, and with cosmic microwave and other background photons during propagation. Any process involving hadronization leads mainly to the production of pions, and isospin symmetry fixes then the ratio of charged to neutral pions produced. The production of neutrinos is thus intimately tied to the one of photons, and both depend in turn on the flux of primary cosmic rays. This is the basis of the multi-messenger approach to UHECR physics [1].

In this work, we will address the question if a single source class can explain *i*) the extragalactic CR flux, *ii*) its nuclear composition and *iii*) the observed neutrino flux in IceCube. Moreover, we will require that *iv*) the accompanying photon flux is only a subdominant contribution to the extragalactic gamma-ray background (EGRB) measured by Fermi-LAT [2]. Finally, *v*) the model should be consistent with an early galactic to extragalactic transition. No model has been developed yet which satisfies all five requirements. Since the neutrino flux measured by IceCube is high [3], i.e. close to the cascade limit [4], combining *iii*) and *iv*) is challenging for many source classes. Moreover, existing models aiming to reproduce the observed nuclear composition of UHECRs fail to produce sizable neutrino fluxes [5, 6]. In contrast, models leading to large neutrino fluxes in the 0.1–1 PeV energy range use typically proton primaries with 10–100 PeV energies, without a direct connection to measurements of UHECR composition [7].

II. CONSTRAINTS

Let us now explain these conditions in more detail. Additionally to the all-particle CR spectrum, data on the primary composition have become available in the last years: The Auger collaboration derived the fraction of four different elemental groups above $6 \times 10^{17}\,\mathrm{eV}$ [8], while the KASCADE-Grande experiment measured the composition up to $2 \times 10^{17}\,\mathrm{eV}$ [9]. These measurements can be summarized as follows: First, the proton fraction amounts to $\sim$ 40–60% in the energy range between $7 \times 10^{17}\,\mathrm{eV}$ and $7 \times 10^{18}\,\mathrm{eV}$ and decreases afterwards, while the fraction of intermediate nuclei increases. Second, the iron fraction in the energy range between $7 \times 10^{17}\,\mathrm{eV}$ and $2 \times 10^{19}\,\mathrm{eV}$ is limited by $\lesssim$ 15–20%. Despite of both theoretical and experimental uncertainties, the following conclusions can be drawn: First, the Galactic contribution to the observed CR spectrum has to die out around $7 \times 10^{17}\,\mathrm{eV}$. This inference is supported by limits on the CR dipole anisotropy which require a transition below $\sim 10^{18}\,\mathrm{eV}$ in case of a light composition [10]. Consequently, we demand an early Galactic-extragalactic transition and have to explain therefore the ankle as a feature in the extragalactic CR spectrum. Second, the composition measurements are inconsistent with a strong dominance of either protons or iron nuclei. We assume therefore that a mixture of nuclei is injected in the source, with a rigidity dependent maximal energy.

The main part of the EGRB is attributed to unresolved blazars [11–13]. This makes blazars and in par-

ticular BL Lacs attractive neutrino sources, since their contribution to the EGRB is much larger than the one from other sources. An attempt to connect the observed UHECR proton flux with neutrino and gamma-ray data was performed in Ref. [14]. However, correlation studies of arrival directions of muon neutrinos with Fermi blazars showed that blazars cannot be the main source of IceCube neutrinos [15]. Thus leptonic models are favored to explain the main part of the photon flux from blazars. As a result, neutrino sources should give a subdominant contribution to the EGRB.

III. SOURCE MODEL

To be specific, we will assume in the following that UHECRs are accelerated by (a subclass of) active galactic nuclei (AGN). Acceleration could proceed either via shock acceleration in accretion shocks [16] or via acceleration in regular fields [17–21] close to the supermassive black hole (SMBH). Alternatively, UHECRs could be accelerated in large-scale radio jets [22] or via a two-step acceleration process in the jet and a radio-lobe [23]. We neglect the details of the acceleration process, and assume that the energy spectra of nuclei follow a power-law with a rigidity dependent cutoff

$$j_{\rm inj}(E) \propto E^{-\alpha} \exp[-E/(ZE_{\rm max})] \,. \qquad (1)$$

Subsequently, the CR nuclei have to diffuse first through a zone dominated by photo-hadronic interactions, before they escape into a second zone dominated by hadronic interactions with gas. The propagation in both zones is modeled as a one-dimensional process, determined by the ratio τ of the interaction rate $R_{\rm int}$ to the escape rate $R_{\rm esc}$.

The spectra of AGN show a characteristic blue bump, produced by UV photons emitted from the accretion disk surrounding the SMBH [24]. At lower energies, the spectra are dominated by thermal emission from dust surrounding the SMBH. We assume that these IR photons provide the main interaction target and approximate their energy spectrum by a thermal distribution. We parametrise the interaction depth τ as $\tau_0^{p\gamma} = R_{\rm int}/R_{\rm esc}$, using protons with energy $E_0 = 10\,$EeV as reference. We assume that the accelerated CR nuclei escape from the region filled with thermal photons in a diffusive way, so that their escape rate $R_{\rm esc}$ is proportional to $(E/Z)^{\delta_{p\gamma}}$. For the numerical simulations, we use the open source code [25] which is based on kinetic equations in one-dimension. Since the propagation time is the same for all particles in the code, diffusion of charged particles is taken into account by multiplying the interaction rates by the escape times and setting the propagation time equal to one. Then the spectra of charged particles are attenuated like $\exp(-\tau)$, while neutrons escape freely.

In the case of hadronic interactions, we model both the escape and the nuclei-proton interactions as a Monte Carlo process, using QGSJET-II-04 [26] to describe strong interactions. We assume now that charged CRs diffuse in an extended halo and model escape and interactions in the leaky-box picture. The produced neutrons escape again freely. The source is then fully described specifying the interaction depth $\tau_0^{pp} = R_{\rm int}/R_{\rm esc}$ of protons at the reference energy $E_0 = 10\,$EeV and the energy dependence of the escape rate, $R_{\rm esc} = R_0[E/(ZE_0)]^{\delta_{pp}}$.

The spectrum of particles exiting the source is then used in the third step as an "effective injection spectrum", from which we calculate the resulting diffuse flux, taking into account the distribution $\rho(z, L)$ of sources as well as the interaction of protons, electrons and photons with the EBL and the CMB. For these steps, we use again the code [25]. We employ as our baseline EBL model the one of Ref. [27], but have verified that other models, e.g. the more recent one [28], lead only to small variations in the CR flux and composition. For the source density evolution we use the parameterization obtained for AGNs in Ref. [29], choosing parameters corresponding to $\log(L_X/{\rm erg}) = 43.5$. As second option, we use the parameterization for BL Lac/FR1 evolution presented in [30]. We perform steps 1–3 injecting pure p, He, N, Si or Fe primaries in the initial step and obtain then results for a mixed injection spectrum performing a linear combination of the final spectra.

IV. RESULTS

Having calculated for a specific set of source parameters the diffuse flux of UHECR nuclei and their secondaries, we combine them with the high-energy part of the Galactic CR fluxes predicted in the escape model [32]. We aim to reproduce the total CR flux [8, 9, 33], the average maximum $X_{\rm max}$ of observed CR-induced air-showers and the width of $X_{\rm max}$ distributions [34]. Since the experimental and theoretical systematic uncertainties in both the $X_{\rm max}$ and the RMS($X_{\rm max}$) measurements are difficult to quantify, we do not perform a standard χ^2 analysis. Instead, we determine first the nuclear composition of extragalactic CRs which fits best the observed total CR flux, since this is the most reliable quantity. After that we check if the composition is allowed by the EGRB constraint and results in a sufficiently large neutrino flux.

We consider first the case that photo-hadronic interactions are negligible. Requiring both a small contribution to the EGRB and a large contribution to the neutrino signal observed by IceCube restricts the allowed range of slopes α strongly, $\alpha \lesssim 2.1$. We choose $\delta_{Ap} = 0.5$ as the energy-dependence of the escape rate $R_{\rm esc} = R_0[E/(ZE_0)]^{1/2}$, corresponding to Kraichnan turbulence. The interaction and escape rates have been normalized such that $\tau_0^{pp} = 0.035$ for proton primaries at the reference energy $E_0 = 10\,$EeV. Since the interaction depth decreases with increasing energies in the case of hadronic interactions, due to the rise of the diffusion, the UHECR flux is dominated by primary nuclei. In order to reproduce the light component in the KASKADE-



FIG. 1: Predictions for the diffuse flux (top) of five elemental groups together with the proton (orange errorbars) and total (blue errorbars) flux from KASCADE, KASCADE-Grande [9] and Auger (black errorbars) [8, 33], the EGRB from Fermi-LAT (red errorbars) [2], and the high-energy neutrino flux from IceCube (magenta errorbars) [3]; the middle and lower panels compare predictions for $X_{\rm max}$and RMS($X_{\rm max}$) using the EPOS-LHC [35] and QGSJET-II-04 [26] models to data from Auger [34]. Left panels for only hadronic interactions with $\alpha = 1.8$, $E_{\rm max} = 3 \times 10^{18}$ eV and BL Lac evolution. Right panels for both $A\gamma$ and Ap interactions with $\alpha = 1.5$, $E_{\rm max} = 6 \times 10^{18}$ eV, $\tau^{p\gamma} = 0.29$ and AGN evolution. The hadronic interaction depth is normalised as $\tau_0^{pp} = 0.035$.

Grande data, the extragalactic CR flux has to remain light up to 10^{18} eV. Insisting to reproduce the ankle requires a relatively low cutoff energy, $E_{\rm max} = 3 \times 10^{18}$ eV, and a small contribution of intermediate nuclei. Thus the wish to describe the ankle including the sub-ankle region by extragalactic CRs drives the composition towards a two-component model, consisting mainly of protons and iron. Note, that in this scenario the intermediate CNO nuclei have a peak around the ankle energy and can not give significant contribution without strongly reducing the proton flux. A reduction of the proton flux would in turn reduce the neutrino flux and the model would fail to explain the IceCube data.

The upper left panel of Fig. 1 shows the resulting diffuse fluxes of CR nuclei and their secondaries. Both the ankle, which corresponds in this scenario to the transition between the proton and iron dominated components in the extragalactic CR flux, and the proton (light) component observed by KASCADE-Grande are reproduced well. The contribution to the diffuse EGRB is low except in the TeV range, while the neutrino flux is somewhat below the level indicated by IceCube observations. The two lower left panels of Fig. 1 show the predicted shower maximum $X_{\rm max}$ and the corresponding distribution width RMS($X_{\rm max}$), respectively. Since the composition above the ankle is heavy, the predicted $X_{\rm max}$ coincides with the one of Fe, in contradiction to observations. Also the predicted width RMS($X_{\rm max}$) is smaller than the observed one.

In our second scenario, we add photo-hadronic interactions close to the source. In contrast to hadronic interactions, photo-nuclear interactions with IR photons can have relatively large interaction depths leading to the dominance of secondary nuclei in the ankle region. The parameter space of this case, however without including hadronic interactions on gas, was extensively studied in Ref. [6]. We employ therefore simply their base case, using $T = 850\,$K, $\tau^{p\gamma} = 0.29$ and $\delta_{p\gamma} = 0.77$ for diffusion close to the source. In contrast to Ref. [6], we assume however a compact acceleration region and use therefore an exponential attenuation. Moreover, we choose as injection slope $\alpha = 1.5$ and $E_{\rm max} = 6 \times 10^{18}$ eV. The interaction depth for hadronic interactions is kept as before, i.e. normalised as $\tau_0^{pp} = 0.035$. The resulting diffuse fluxes of CR nuclei and their secondaries are shown in the upper right panel of Fig. 1. The spectra of intermediate nuclei show a narrow a dip: The low-energy end of this dip is determined by the threshold energy for photodissociation, which is at higher energies partly filled by secondary nuclei generated by heavier primary nuclei. The resulting neutrino flux matches now IceCube data, while the contribution to the diffuse EGRB is now of order 30 %. The two lower right panels of Fig. 1 show the predicted shower maximum $X_{\rm max}$ and the corresponding distribution width RMS($X_{\rm max}$), respectively. Accounting for the systematic uncertainties of the experimental data and of the hadronic interaction models, the two distributions are well reproduced. Note that the peak in RMS($X_{\rm max}$) peaks could be shifted to lower energies, reducing the extragalactic proton flux somewhat. This may indicate that not all neutrons escape freely from their sources.

V. DISCUSSION

Let us now comment in which astrophysical environments the considered UHECR interactions could be realized. Interaction depths of order one for proton-gamma interaction arise naturally from interactions on thermal IR photons [36]. These photons may be either emitted by the dust torus of few parsecs extension or, as considered here, from a more compact source region [37]. Similarly, the dust and gas in the accretion disc surrounding the SMBH provides a target for hadronic interactions of UHECRs. In both cases, UHECRs have to be accelerated close to the SMBH, excluding e.g. acceleration sites as radio lobes of AGN jets. The composition of injected CRs has to be strongly enhanced towards intermediate nuclei compared to the solar composition. This may suggest a connection to the tidal ignition of white dwarf stars close the the SMBH, as suggested recently in Ref. [38]. Next we comment on the implication of our results for the EGRB. Since the AGN evolution peaks early, the spectral shape of the photon flux is close to the "universal shape" obtained after many cascade generations [39], which in turn reproduces well the observed shape of the EGRB. Moreover, reproducing the large neutrino flux observed by IceCube requires that in our model unresolved AGN contribute around 30% to the EGRB.

Finally, we comment on the dependence of our results on the used experimental data and the hadronic interaction model. Using the data of the Telescope Array (TA) experiment [40] is complicated, since the effects of the experimental cuts and of the reconstruction bias have to be included. A preliminary analysis, using the method of Ref. [41] to mimic these effects, showed that the TA data favor a lighter composition than obtained here, represented by a mixture of protons and helium nuclei. On the other hand, such a mixture is disfavored by the PAO analysis using the correlations between the maximum depth $X_{\rm max}$ and the ground detector signal [42]. We note also that the deeper $X_{\rm max}$ values predicted by the EPOS-LHC model are disfavored by the PAO analysis of the maximal muon production depth $X^{\mu}_{\rm max}$ [43]. As discussed in Refs. [44, 45], the deeper $X_{\rm max}$ values of EPOS are due to an enhanced (anti-) baryon production and a large diffractive cross section for pion-air collisions. On the other hand, these features are responsible for the large $X^{\mu}_{\rm max}$ values predicted by EPOS, which are in contradiction to PAO measurements [43]. In addition, Ref. [45] suggested that the smaller RMS($X_{\rm max}$) for primary iron in EPOS results from deficiencies in its treatment of the fragmentation of nuclear spectator particles.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied, if a single source class can explain both the flux and the composition of extragalactic CRs including the sub-ankle region and the high-energy neutrinos observed by IceCube. Using only hadronic interactions of UHECRs with gas around their sources, we have obtained a good fit to the CR energy spectrum, however, only if intermediate nuclei are sub-dominant. Therefore the predicted maximum $X_{\rm max}$ of CR-induced air showers lies higher in the atmosphere than observed. Adding photo-nuclear interactions, with a relatively large interaction depth, thus leading to pronounced dips in the primary nuclear fluxes, we were able to fit satisfactorily both the spectrum and the composition data on UHECRs. At the same time, the high-energy neutrino flux obtained matches IceCube measurements, while the contribution of unresolved UHECR sources to the EGRB is of order 30%. The large interaction depth for photo-nuclear interactions suggest that UHECRs are accelerated close to SMBHs.

Acknowledgments—S.O. acknowledges support from project OS 481/1 of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. This research was supported in part with computational resources at NTNU provided by NOTUR, `http://www.sigma2.no`, and at the Theoretical Physics Division of the INR RAS with support by the RFBR, grant 16-29-13065 ofi-m.

Note added: While we were preparing this work for submission, the preprint arXiv:1704.00015 appeared. The authors explain the neutrino flux measured by IceCube by CR interactions in the galaxy clusters surrounding UHECR sources. While the basic scheme may be considered as a specific realisation of our first secenario, our attitude differs. Since we require that the neutrino sources explain the observed UHECR flux, we discard the case $\alpha \simeq 2.2$ and AGN evolution considered in arXiv:1704.00015, because it does not fit the UHECR flux: In contrast to our assumption, the scenario of arXiv:1704.00015 implies that neutrino sources are only a subdominant source of UHECRs.

[1] T. K. Gaisser, F. Halzen and T. Stanev, Phys. Rept. **258**, 173 (1995) Erratum: [Phys. Rept. **271**, 355 (1996)] [hep-ph/9410384].

[2] M. Ackermann *et al.* [Fermi-LAT Collaboration], Astrophys. J. **799**, no. 1, 86 (2015) [arXiv:1410.3696 [astro-ph.HE]].

[3] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* [IceCube Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 101101 (2014) [arXiv:1405.5303 [astro-ph.HE]].

[4] V. S. Berezinsky and A. Y. Smirnov, Astrophys. Space Sci. **32**, 461 (1975); V. Berezinsky, A. Gazizov, M. Kachelrieß and S. Ostapchenko, Phys. Lett. B **695**, 13 (2011) [arXiv:1003.1496 [astro-ph.HE]].

[5] N. Globus, D. Allard and E. Parizot, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 021302 (2015) [arXiv:1505.01377 [astro-ph.HE]].

[6] M. Unger, G. R. Farrar and L. A. Anchordoqui, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 123001 (2015) [arXiv:1505.02153 [astro-ph.HE]].

[7] K. Murase, D. Guetta and M. Ahlers, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 7, 071101 (2016) [arXiv:1509.00805 [astro-ph.HE]]. P. Padovani, E. Resconi, P. Giommi, B. Arsioli and Y. L. Chang, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **457**, 3582 (2016) [arXiv:1601.06550 [astro-ph.HE]]. O. Kalashev, D. Semikoz and I. Tkachev, J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **120**, 541 (2015) [arXiv:1410.8124 [astro-ph.HE]].

[8] A. Aab *et al.* [Pierre Auger Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 12, 122006 (2014) [arXiv:1409.5083 [astro-ph.HE]].

[9] W. D. Apel *et al.* [KASCADE-Grande Collaboration], Astropart. Phys. **47**, 54 (2013).

[10] G. Giacinti, M. Kachelrieß, D. V. Semikoz and G. Sigl, JCAP **1207**, 031 (2012) [arXiv:1112.5599 [astro-ph.HE]]; P. Abreu *et al.* [Pierre Auger Collaboration], Astrophys. J. **762**, L13 (2012) [arXiv:1212.3083 [astro-ph.HE]].

[11] A. Neronov and D. V. Semikoz, Astrophys. J. **757**, 61 (2012) [arXiv:1103.3484 [astro-ph.CO]].

[12] M. Di Mauro, F. Donato, G. Lamanna, D. A. Sanchez and P. D. Serpico, Astrophys. J. **786**, 129 (2014) [arXiv:1311.5708 [astro-ph.HE]].

[13] M. Ajello *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **800**, no. 2, L27 (2015) [arXiv:1501.05301 [astro-ph.HE]].

[14] G. Giacinti, M. Kachelrieß, O. Kalashev, A. Neronov and D. V. Semikoz, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 083016 (2015) [arXiv:1507.07534 [astro-ph.HE]].

[15] A. Neronov, D. V. Semikoz and K. Ptitsyna, arXiv:1611.06338 [astro-ph.HE].

[16] D. Kazanas and D. C.Ellison, Astrophys. J. **304**, 178 (1986).

[17] R. D. Blandford, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **176**, 465 (1976).

[18] R. V. E. Lovelace, Nature, **262**, 649 (1976).

[19] R. D. Blandford and R. L. Znajek, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **179**, 433 (1977).

[20] D. MacDonald and K. S. Thorne, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **198**, 345 (1982).

[21] A. Y. Neronov, D. V. Semikoz and I. I. Tkachev, New J. Phys. **11**, 065015 (2009) [arXiv:0712.1737 [astro-ph]].

[22] J. P. Rachen and P. L. Biermann, Astron. Astrophys. **272**, 161 (1993) [astro-ph/9301010]. J. P. Rachen, T. Stanev and P. L. Biermann, Astron. Astrophys. **273**, 377 (1993) [astro-ph/9302005].

[23] M. J. Hardcastle, C. C. Cheung, I. J. Feain and L. Stawarz, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **393**, 1041 (2009) [arXiv:0808.1593 [astro-ph]].

[24] M. A. Malkan and W. L. W. Sargent, Astrophy. J. **254**, 22 (1982).

[25] O. E. Kalashev and E. Kido, J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **120**, 790 (2015) [arXiv:1406.0735 [astro-ph.HE]].

[26] S. Ostapchenko, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 014018 (2011) [arXiv:1010.1869 [hep-ph]].

[27] Y. Inoue, S. Inoue, M. A. R. Kobayashi, R. Makiya, Y. Niino and T. Totani, Astrophys. J. **768**, 197 (2013)

[arXiv:1212.1683 [astro-ph.CO]].
[28] F. W. Stecker, S. T. Scully and M. A. Malkan, Astrophys. J. **827**, 6 (2016) [arXiv:1605.01382 [astro-ph.HE]].
[29] G. Hasinger, T. Miyaji and M. Schmidt, Astron. Astrophys. **441**, 417 (2005) [astro-ph/0506118].
[30] M. Di Mauro, F. Donato, G. Lamanna, D. A. Sanchez and P. D. Serpico, Astrophys. J. **786**, 129 (2014) [arXiv:1311.5708 [astro-ph.HE]]; for the chosen parameters see Ref. [14].
[31] G. Giacinti, M. Kachelrieß and D. V. Semikoz, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 041302 (2014) [arXiv:1403.3380 [astro-ph.HE]].
[32] G. Giacinti, M. Kachelrieß and D. V. Semikoz, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 083009 (2015) [arXiv:1502.01608 [astro-ph.HE]].
[33] A. Aab *et al.* [Pierre Auger Collaboration], Braz. J. Phys. **44**, 560 (2014) [arXiv:1310.4620 [astro-ph.HE]].
[34] A. Aab *et al.* [Pierre Auger Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **90**, 122005 (2014) [arXiv:1409.4809 [astro-ph.HE]].
[35] T. Pierog, I. Karpenko, J. M. Katzy, E. Yatsenko and K. Werner, Phys. Rev. C **92**, 034906 (2015) [arXiv:1306.0121 [hep-ph]].
[36] M. Kachelrieß, S. Ostapchenko and Tomas, Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral. **27**, 482 (2010) [arXiv:1002.4874 [astro-ph.HE]].
[37] K. Meisenheimer *et al.*, Astron. Astrophys. **471**, 453 (2007) [arXiv:0707.0177 [astro-ph]].
[38] R. Alves Batista and J. Silk, arXiv:1702.06978 [astro-ph.HE].
[39] M. Kachelrieß, S. Ostapchenko and Tomas, Comput. Phys. Commun. **183**, 1036 (2012) [arXiv:1106.5508 [astro-ph.HE]]; V. Berezinsky and O. Kalashev, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 023007 (2016) [arXiv:1603.03989 [astro-ph.HE]].
[40] R. U. Abbasi *et al.* (Telescope Array Collaboration), Astropart. Phys. **64**, 49 (2015).
[41] S. Ostapchenko, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 074009 (2014).
[42] A. Aab *et al.* (Pirre Auger Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B762**, 288 (2016).
[43] A. Aab *et al.* (Pierre Auger Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **90**, 012012 (2014); *ibid.*, **90**, 039904 (2014); *ibid.*, **92**, 019903 (2015).
[44] S. Ostapchenko and M. Bleicher, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 051501 (2016).
[45] S. Ostapchenko, arXiv:1612.09461.